1 2	Gregory C. Nuti (Bar No. 151754) Schnader Harrison Segal & Lewis LLP One Montgomery Street, Suite 2200 San Francisco, CA 94104-5501	
3		
4 gnuti@schnader.com		
5	Arlene P. Messinger Assistant General Counsel for SBIC Enforcement	
6	U.S. Small Business Administration 409 3rd Street, S.W., Seventh Floor	
7 8	Washington, D.C. 20416 Telephone (202) 205-6857 Facsimile (202) 481-0325	
9 10	Attorneys for Plaintiff, United States Small Business Administration in it capacity as Receiver for Alto Tech II, L.P.	cs
10	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
12	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
13	SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION	
13	212.232.231	Case No. C 07-4530
14 15	United States Small Business Administration in its capacity as Receiver for Alto Tech II, L.P.,	
16	Plaintiff,	CERTIFICATE O
17	vs.	
18	Alto Tech Ventures, LLC, a Delaware limited liability company; Alto Tech Management,	
19	LLC, a California limited liability company; Gloria Chen Wahl, an individual; Walter T.C	
20	Lee, an individual and Thanos Triant, an individual,	
21	Defendants.	
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		

Case No. C 07-4530 SC

# **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

NAME ADDRESS AND TEASERS PORTUGED 4530 Story Document 3 Filed 09/18/2007 Page 2 of 5

GREGORY C. NUTI

SCHNADER, HARRISON, SEGAL & LEWIS

1 Montgomery Street, Suite 2200

San Francisco, CA 94104 Telephone: (415) 364-6700

ATTORNEY(S) FOR: Plaintiff

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

UNITED STATES SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION, etc.

Plaintiff,

CASE NUMBER C07-4530 SC

V.

ALTO TECH VENTURES, LLC, et al.

Defendant.

DECLARATION OF SERVICE

At the time of service I was a citizen of the United States, over the age of eighteen, and not a party to this action; I served copies of the:

SUMMONS IN A CIVIL CASE; COMPLAINT; CIVIL COVER SHEET; ORDER SETTING INITIAL CASE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE AND ADR DEADLINES; WELCOME TO THE U.S. DISTRICT COURT, SAN FRANCISCO; ECF REGISTRATION INFORMATION HANDOUT; NOTICE OF AVAILABILITY OF MAGISTRATE JUDGE TO EXERCISE JURISDICTION

in the within action by personally delivering true copies thereof to the person served as follows:

Served

: THANOS TRIANT

By serving

: Simone Silva, Competent Member of Household

Address

: (Home)

2170 Stockbridge Avenue

Woodside, CA 94062

Date of Service : September 6, 2007

Time of Service : 8:24 PM

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing information is true and correct.

Date: September 7, 2007

SPECIALIZED LEGAL SERVICES 1112 Bryant Street, Suite 200 San Francisco, CA 94103 Telephone: (415) 357-0500 Registered Alameda Number 1006

Signature:

ÁRVIS Ď. HASKIN

GREGORY C. NUTTI 3:07-cv-04530-SC Document 3 Filed 09/18/2007 Page 3 of 5

SCHNADER, HARRISON, SEGAL & LEWIS
1 Montgomery Street, Suite 2200

San Francisco, CA 94104 Telephone: (415) 364-6700 Attorney for: Plaintiff

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Plaintiff: UNITED STATES SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION, etc.

Defendant: ALTO TECH VENTURES, LLC, et al.

Ref#: 221587 \* **DECLARATION OF MAILING** \* Case No.: C07-4530 SC

At the time of service I was at least eighteen years of age and not a party to this action and I served copies of the:

SUMMONS IN A CIVIL CASE; COMPLAINT; CIVIL COVER SHEET; ORDER SETTING INITIAL CASE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE AND ADR DEADLINES; WELCOME TO THE U.S. DISTRICT COURT, SAN FRANCISCO; ECF REGISTRATION INFORMATION HANDOUT; NOTICE OF AVAILABILITY OF MAGISTRATE JUDGE TO EXERCISE JURISDICTION

in the within action by placing true copies thereof in a sealed envelope with first class postage fully prepaid thereon in the United States mail at San Francisco, California, addressed as follows:

THANOS TRIANT

(Home) 2170 Stockbridge Avenue Woodside, CA 94062

Date of Mailing: September 7, 2007

Person who served papers: JARVIS D. HASKIN SPECIALIZED LEGAL SERVICES, INC. 1112 Bryant Street, Suite 200 San Francisco, CA 94103 Telephone: (415) 357-0500

Fee for service: \$117.50 Registered California process server. (i) Employee or Independent Contractor

(ii) Registration no.: 1006

(iii) County: Alameda

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct.

Date: September 7, 2007

Signature

(CORPORATE DEFENDANT)

~ (CEV. 10/93)

## WAIVER OF SERVICE OF SUMMONS

(NAME OF PLAINTIFF'S ATTORNEY OR UNREPRESENTED PLAINTIFF)

Clear Form

I. Gloria Chen Wahl . acknowledge receipt of your request (DEFENDANT NAME) United States Small Business Administration in capacity as that I waive service of summons in the action of Receiver for Alto Tech II I. P v Alto Tech Ventures et , (CAPTION OF ACTION) which is case number C 07-4530 SC in the United States District Court (DOCKET NUMBER) for the Northern District of California. I have also received a copy of the complaint in the action, two copies of this instrument, and a means by which I can return the signed waiver to you without cost to me. I agree to save the cost of service of a summons and an additional copy of the complaint in this lawsuit by not requiring that I (or the entity on whose behalf I am acting) be served with judicial process in the manner provided by Rule 4. I (or the entity on whose behalf I am acting) will retain all defenses or objections to the lawsuit or to the jurisdiction or venue of the court except for objections based on a defect in the summons or in the service of the summons. I understand that a judgment may be entered against me (or the party on whose behalf I am acting) if an answer or motion under Rule 12 is not served upon you within 60 days September 5, 2007 after or within 90 days after that date if the request was sent outside the United States. Chung-Han Lee Printed/Typed Name: Attorney Gloria Chen Wahl

#### Duty to Avoid Unnecessary Costs of Service of Summons

Rule 4 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure requires certain parties to cooperate in saving unnecessary costs of service of the summons and complaint. A defendant located in the United States who, after being notified of an action and asked by a plaintiff located in the United States to waive service of summons, fails to do so will be required to bear the cost of such service unless good cause be shown for its failure to sign and return the waiver.

It is not good cause for a failure to waive service that a party believes that the complaint is unfounded, or that the action has been brought in an improper place or in a court that lacks jurisdiction over the subject matter of the action or over its person or property. A party who waives service of the summons retains all defenses and objections (except any relating to the summons or to the service of the summons), and may later object to the jurisdiction of the court or to the place where the action has been brought.

A defendant who waives service must within the time specified on the waiver form serve on the plaintiff's attorney (or unrepresented plaintiff) a response to the complaint and must also file a signed copy of the response with the court. If the answer or motion is not served within this time, a default judgment may be taken against that defendant. By waiving service, a defendant is allowed more time to answer than if the summons had been actually served when the request for waiver of service was received.

%AO 399 (Rev. 10/95)

Clear Form

### WAIVER OF SERVICE OF SUMMONS

(NAME OF PLAINTIFF'S ATTORNEY OR UNREPRESENTED PLAINTIFF)

I, Walter T.G. Lee	. acknowledge receipt of your request
(DEFENDANT	
that I waive service of summons in the a	United States Small Business Administration in capacity as ction of Receiver for Alto Tech H. P. v. Alto Tech Ventures et (CAPTION OF ACTION)
which is case number C 07-4530 SC	in the United States District Court
γ-	OCKET NUMBER)
for the Northern District of California.	
I have also received a copy of the comeans by which I can return the signed v	omplaint in the action, two copies of this instrument, and a waiver to you without cost to me.
	a summons and an additional copy of the complaint in this tity on whose behalf I am acting) be served with judicial process
	a acting) will retain all defenses or objections to the lawsuit or except for objections based on a defect in the summons or in the
to the jurisdiction or venue of the court of service of the summons.	
to the jurisdiction or venue of the court esservice of the summons.  I understand that a judgment may be if an	except for objections based on a defect in the summons or in the entered against me (or the party on whose behalf I am acting)
to the jurisdiction or venue of the court of service of the summons.  I understand that a judgment may be	except for objections based on a defect in the summons or in the entered against me (or the party on whose behalf I am acting)
to the jurisdiction or venue of the court of service of the summons.  I understand that a judgment may be if an answer or motion under Rule 12 is not see	except for objections based on a defect in the summons or in the e entered against me (or the party on whose behalf I am acting) erved upon you within 60 days
to the jurisdiction or venue of the court of service of the summons.  I understand that a judgment may be aff an answer or motion under Rule 12 is not seafter	except for objections based on a defect in the summons or in the e entered against me (or the party on whose behalf I am acting) erved upon you within 60 days  September 5, 2007
to the jurisdiction or venue of the court eservice of the summons.  I understand that a judgment may be after or motion under Rule 12 is not seafter or within 90 days after that date if the re	except for objections based on a defect in the summons or in the entered against me (or the party on whose behalf I am acting) erved upon you within 60 days    September 5, 2007
to the jurisdiction or venue of the court of service of the summons.  I understand that a judgment may be sif an answer or motion under Rule 12 is not so after or within 90 days after that date if the re	except for objections based on a defect in the summons or in the entered against me (or the party on whose behalf I am acting)  erved upon you within 60 days  September 5, 2007  (DATE REQUEST WAS SENT)  equest was sent outside the United States.
to the jurisdiction or venue of the court of service of the summons.  I understand that a judgment may be sif an answer or motion under Rule 12 is not seafter or within 90 days after that date if the re  September 14, 2007	except for objections based on a defect in the summons or in the entered against me (or the party on whose behalf I am acting) erved upon you within 60 days    September 5, 2007
to the jurisdiction or venue of the court of service of the summons.  I understand that a judgment may be sif an answer or motion under Rule 12 is not seafter or within 90 days after that date if the re  September 14, 2007	except for objections based on a defect in the summons or in the except for objections based on a defect in the summons or in the except for objections based on a defect in the summons or in the except for objections based on a defect in the summons or in the except for objections based on a defect in the summons or in the except for objections based on a defect in the summons or in the except for objections based on a defect in the summons or in the except for objections based on a defect in the summons or in the except for objections based on a defect in the summons or in the except for objections based on a defect in the summons or in the except for objections based on a defect in the summons or in the except for objections based on a defect in the summons or in the except for objections based on a defect in the summons or in the except for objections based on a defect in the summons or in the except for objections based on a defect in the summons or in the except for objections based on a defect in the summons or in the except for objection based on a defect in the summons or in the except for objection based on a defect in the summons or in the except for objection based on a defect in the summons or in the except for objection based on a defect in the summons of the except for objection based on a defect in the summons of the except for objection based on a defect in the summons or in the except for objection based on a defect in the summons of the except for objection based on a defect in the summons of the except for objection based on a defect in the summons of the except for objection based on a defect in the summons of the except for objection based on a defect in the except for objection based on a defect in the except for objection based on a defect for objection based on a defect in the except for objection based on a defect in the except for objection based on a defect in the except for objection based on a defect in the except for objection based on a defect in the except for objection based on

#### Duty to Avoid Unnecessary Costs of Service of Summons

Rule 4 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure requires certain parties to cooperate in saving unnecessary costs of service of the summons and complaint. A defendant located in the United States who, after being notified of an action and asked by a plaintiff located in the United States to waive service of summons, fails to do so will be required to bear the cost of such service unless good cause be shown for its failure to sign and return the waiver.

It is not good cause for a failure to waive service that a party believes that the complaint is unfounded, or that the action has been brought in an improper place or in a court that lacks jurisdiction over the subject matter of the action or over its person or property. A party who waives service of the summons retains all defenses and objections (except any relating to the summons or to the service of the summons), and may later object to the jurisdiction of the court or to the place where the action has been brought.

A defendant who waives service must within the time specified on the waiver form serve on the plaintiff's attorney (or unrepresented plaintiff) a response to the complaint and must also file a signed copy of the response with the court. If the answer or motion is not served within this time, a default judgment may be taken against that defendant. By waiving service, a defendant is allowed more time to answer than if the summons had been actually served when the request for waiver of service was received.